1: Ray E-5 (1928-38) 1939 Plateau

not antagonistic to Plateau principles, but the exclusiveness with which territory is held is highly atypical. Athabascan groups not only claim nominal title, but are willing to fight to protect their holdings against infringement.

Among Plateau groups recognizing tribal organization there is a tendency toward this rigidness of restriction. The Kutenai and Coeur d'Alêne refuse foreigners the use of their territory, but it must be remembered that all constituent villages have common rights. The Kalispel show only a tendency toward tribal organization, but they require that a visitor from the outside obtain the permission of a chief before hunting within their boundaries. The Yakima carry this notion even further. They insist that such permission be obtained and definitely limit the period of the permit. When the time is elapsed they provide safe convoy for the visitor as far as the Yakima boundary; beyond that point he is upon his own responsibility. Of interest here is the further Yakima practice of stationing scouts at strategic points along the boundary, in the interests of the group as a whole. Thus the lines of demarcation are highly specific here even though the circumscribed area encloses autonomous villages rather than a tribally united people. The adjacent Umatilla and Cayuse tribes treat the Yakima with similar formal hospitality, but give no quarter to their traditional enemies on the south, the Shoshoneans. These southern Plateau groups, together with the Nez Percé and Flathead, maintain tribal or ethnic boundaries on all sides that are quite as specific as the village boundaries on the rivers farther north.[18] The Klamath fall with the central and northern groups, as reflected in Spier's statement,

> The summer camps are rather indiscriminate aggregations of any Klamath, but the winter locations are so fixed of habit as to give a measure of political separatism to the several localities.[19]

Under these conditions it is obvious that the precision with which a boundary line may be indicated is not a function of similar factors in all cases, but may reflect political distinctions either functional or formal, ethnic unity, concordance, or merely geographical conditions.

Chieftainship

In discussing the bases of political organization it has been necessary to refer frequently to the nature of chieftainship. Certain other data will be added here and basic patterns examined.

[18] Ray, *Native Villages*, pp. 17 ff. [19] Spier, *Klamath Ethnography*, p. 11.

3: Ray E-5 (1928-35) 1936 Plateau

idarity under a single war chief during periods of hostility. Proceeding from the Umatilla to the Yakima and Wanapam and thence to the Columbia a gradual diminution in tribal emphasis is observed, with complete disappearance for some distance beyond that point. Illuminating is the former Yakima feeling of responsibility for the safety of any member of another group while he remained within Yakima territory. When the visitor was ready to leave he was given safe convoy to the Yakima boundary, Satus Pass, for example, beyond which he was upon his own responsibility. Also, scouts were stationed at many strategic points, in the interests of the group as a whole. The cementing effect of frequent warfare was to be seen in the organization of the Columbia[27] although this appears to have been a condition of no great age. The northernmost group of the Columbia Basin, the Lakes, exhibited quite a different type of political unity. A marked feeling of solidarity seems to have grown out of the uniqueness of their habitat. They occupied a series of interconnecting lakes and rivers over which they travelled in circuits,[28] making for a maximum of social intercourse and demanding considerable cooperation. Moreover, they were effectively shut off from adjacent groups on the west and north by high mountain ranges. Though conditions of this nature do not in themselves produce political unity, as Dr. Kroeber has pointed out,[29] yet they may prove significant factors in such a development. Among the Lakes this development appears to have occurred.

It is not argued here that village autonomy indicates the absence of any significant unit of larger compass than the village. The essential point is that under these circumstances the larger unit was ethnic or social in nature. Such a group often lacked even so much as a name to describe it. Thus the names Nespelem and Kittitas, for example, which we apply to ethnic groups, are derived from the political names of single villages;[30] in native use they had no such wide application. At other times

[27] Teit, "Middle Columbia Salish," 126.
[28] See map, fig. 2.
[29] Kroeber, 14.
[30] See Nespelem village no. 2, Kittitas no. 2.

3: Ray E-5 (1928-35) 1936 Plateau

The precision with which a boundary line is indicated must not be taken as an index of concordance or culture, but merely as a reflection of ethnic unity. Thus the hunting territory of one group might be quite open to use by another even though the bounds be highly specific. This freedom of use was the rule among many of the Salish groups. But among the Yakima, for example, outsiders were required to obtain formal permis-

Figure 5. Territories of the Middle Columbia Salish and the Northwestern Sahaptin. For village names see text.

3: Ray E-5 (1928-35) 1936 Plateau

609 619 sion from a chief before hunting grounds might be used and even then the length of time was definitely limited.

103 The catalog of villages presented below covers only the Salish groups[54] and the Northwest Sahaptin groups of the eastern Cascade slope. For the purposes of the present paper this quantity of material has proved sufficient but it is planned to complete the village survey by visiting the remaining Sahaptin groups in the near future. A few village and band locations of the latter, already in hand, are included as supplementary material. In the Salish lists for greater completeness I have interpolated village data obtained by James A. Teit[55] where it does not duplicate my own material, and where locations are not ambiguous or indefinite.

No attempt has been made to procure exhaustive lists of temporary camp sites. Throughout the region these were great in number but were often changed. As a sample, however, those on the Sanpoil river are listed below. Though the enumeration of permanent and semi-permanent villages may be taken as relatively complete there is no doubt but that many might be added through further investigation.

VII.

101 Following are notes relating to specific groups:

487 Lakes: Also called Lake,[56] Senijextee, etc.[57] Native name, sna'itck stk[58] (group term). See map, fig. 2. The somewhat unusual shape of Lakes territory grows out of geographical conditions. With but a single short portage it was possible to make circuits of hundreds of miles by

[54]Except the Southern Okanogan and the Columbia. The political organization and the village locations of these groups have been studied by Miss Velpha Walters whose findings are not yet published.

[55]Teit, "Salishan Tribes."

[56]This is Teit's term; I have followed native practice, using the plural, since several lakes (Upper Arrow, Lower Arrow, Slocan, etc.) are included in the reference.

[57]For a further synonymy of the Lakes and other groups see Hodge "Handbook."

194 [58]The phonetic system here used for transcribing native names is that recommended in the report of a committee of the American Anthropological Association entitled "Phonetic Transcription of Indian Languages," in *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections* (Washington, 1916), LXVI, no. 6. Briefly, all unmarked vowels have continental values; *a* with superscript period as in English *ask;* turned *e* as the obscure vowel (*a* in English *idea*); Greek epsilon as the vowel of English *end;* Greek omega